

From: David.Rosario@chase.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 6:55pm
Subject: Monopoly comment

I would like to comment on this topic.

I'm sure that everyone is aware of the fact of Microsoft's monopoly, including Microsoft themselves, yet many reject to acknowledge reality and put a spin on the truth (aka lie!) In fact, I remember Microsoft's vision in the early 1990's: "Windows everywhere" is what they called it - in computers, cable boxes, refrigerators - pretty much anywhere they could get it into. That is what they would like to see. Along the way they have demolished many companies to further their cause and gain an unfair advantage.

Toward the mid-1990's they stated that they would port their Office suite to OS/2 when OS/2 reached critical mass - 2 million users, according to them. What happened? OS/2 reached critical mass and Microsoft never delivered on their promise. Why? Because OS/2 was superior to Windows and would directly compete with them.

In an effort to fool everyone, Microsoft invested in Apple and updated their Office suite for the Macintosh. They did this because they needed a "competitor" that could take some of their market share. Microsoft was merely trying to convince naive individuals that there was a viable alternative to Windows, namely the Macintosh, that could compete with them. I have heard too many reasons as to why the Mac is not as successful as hoped (and you will see the relevance of this) but nobody has stated the correct reason. The correct reason that the Mac has failed is because of their closed hardware architecture and exorbitant prices. Can you buy a Mac-compatible device from another vendor? No. Can you buy a non-Apple computer that runs the MacOS (or OS X)? No. How is this important? The only two operating systems (for desktops, not servers) that Microsoft has attacked are OS/2 and Linux. Why? Because you can use the same computer that runs Windows to run OS/2 or Linux. OS/2 and Linux have had a serious following. Sure there have been other desktop operating systems for the PC like BeOS, but they never received serious support. Microsoft has spread vicious lies about Linux to any non-technical manager that will lend an ear just because those are the ignorant type of managers that make technical decisions.

OS/2 created a version named "OS/2 for Windows" (aka Ferengi). With this, the cost of OS/2 would be lower because it didn't include Windows 3.1 which was an additional license charge. You could use your existing Windows and OS/2 would incorporate it. Microsoft's response? They released a modified version of Windows which became incompatible with OS/2 for Windows. How's that for uncompetitive?

I heard Microsoft's arguments about how they felt the Netscape browser was a threat to Windows, which prompted them to take the actions they did. However, everyone seemed to overlook the fact that you need an operating system to run a browser. A browser is capable of rudimentary operations. Even with Java applets, they do not have the flexibility of Java applications. However, you still need a JRE (Java Runtime Environment) to be able to run applets, and where does the JRE reside? In the operating system! I don't know how Microsoft was able to argue that Netscape's browser was a threat to their operating system. It is just not possible.

Microsoft must be forced to publish API's for all of their products and port their products to competing operating systems. Compilers and window toolkits (like Qt) that grew up on Unix were made to run on Windows - now it's time for them to do the same.

Microsoft has a history of introducing incompatibilities with accepted standards to further their cause. J++ had Windows-specific hooks. Their Kerberos implementation is incompatible (to an extent) with the Unix standard. Their motto is "embrace and extend". This is completely uncompetitive. Something must be done about it. Having them donate resources to schools (a proposed remedy) is just a way for them to further increase their penetration into the market. We are in a county that opposes taxation without representation. Now it's time to represent the taxpayers voicing their opinions. Let's see if the U.S. Government's judiciary system actually works the way they teach us it does.